



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/164,392	09/30/1998	DONG-GYU KIM	33404/DBP/Y3	6608

7590

09/18/2002

McGuire Woods LLP  
1750 Tysons Boulevard  
Suite 1800  
McLean, VA 22102

EXAMINER

LANEAU, RONALD

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2674

DATE MAILED: 09/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/164,392

Applicant(s)

KIM, DONG-GYU

Examiner

Ronald Laneau

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/02.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Response to Amendment***

1. The amendment filed on 7/02/02 has been entered. New claims 17-21 are added and claims 1-21 are now pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. Claims 1-8, 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hashimoto (6,295,043).

As per claim 1, Hashimoto teaches a method of driving a liquid crystal display having a matrix of a plurality of pixels with a common electrode and a pixel electrode, comprising the steps of:

dividing a plurality of pixels into a plurality of groups, each group comprising a plurality of pixels that are adjacent to each other (see figs. 2C, 2D).

applying a common voltage to the common electrode; and

applying a data voltage of a positive polarity and a negative polarity with respect to the common voltage alternately to groups of a plurality of pixels that are adjacently located,

wherein the polarity of the data voltage applied to each of the pixels in each group is the same (see abstract and figure 2B).

As per claim 2, Hashimoto et al teach a method wherein the pixel group is comprised of three pixels as claimed (see fig. 2B).

As per claim 3, Hashimoto et al teach a method wherein the pixel group is comprised of a red pixel, a green pixel, and a blue pixel (see figs. 2B, 4).

As per claims 4 and 5, Hashimoto teaches a method wherein data voltages having the same polarity or different polarities with respect to the common voltage are applied to the adjacent pixels on the same column (see fig. 4).

As per claims 6 and 17, Hashimoto et al teach a liquid crystal display comprising a substrate, a plurality of gate lines formed on the substrate, a plurality of data lines insulated and intersecting the gate lines and transmitting a data voltage; and a plurality of pixels formed corresponding to respective regions defined by the data lines and the gate lines, wherein a common voltage is applied to the plurality of pixels, and wherein polarities of the data voltage with respect to the common voltage are inverted in a unit of pixel group, and wherein the pixel group is comprised of two or more pixels (see abstract, figs. 2B, 4).

As per claim 7, Hashimoto et al teach a method wherein the pixel group is comprised of three pixels as claimed (see fig. 2B).

As per claim 8, Hashimoto et al teach a method wherein the pixel group is comprised of a red pixel, a green pixel, and a blue pixel (see figs. 2B, 4).

As per claim 16, Hashimoto et al teach a method wherein the pixel group is comprised of a column of red pixels, a column of green pixels, and a column of blue pixels (see figs. 2B, 4).

As per claim 18, Hashimoto et al teach an LCD wherein adjacent two pixels in row direction have different polarities of the data voltage (see figs. 2C, 2D).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2674

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 9-15 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto (6,295,043).

As per claims 9 and 10, see rejection of claim 6. Hashimoto et al do not expressly teach about a distance between a first data line adjacent to the pixel group and a pixel adjacent to the first data line but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to know that one would increase the distance between the two groups of pixels because it would clearly distinguish one group of pixels from the other.

As per claims 11 and 12, Hashimoto et al do not teach an LCD wherein the gate lines are not only arranged in groups of two but a connecting member connects the first common line and second common line but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize an LCD with the gate lines arranged as claimed for the same reasons given in claim 9.

As per claims 13-15, Hashimoto et al do not teach an LCD wherein common lines are connected to common electrodes and a connecting member connects the first common line and a second common line but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize an LCD with the common lines arranged as claimed for the same reasons given in claim 9.

As per claims 19-21, Hashimoto et al do not teach an LCD wherein the common electrode is parallel to the pixel electrode and wherein the common electrode is arranged between the adjacent pixel but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a common electrode as claimed because it would provide an improved display with high reliability for a long time.

*Response to Arguments*

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/02/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Hashimoto et al fail to teach or suggest "applying a data voltage of a positive polarity and a negative polarity with respect to the common voltage alternately per each frame to the plurality of groups." The examiner believes that the device taught by Hashimoto is well capable of applying data voltage of different polarities as claimed. Figure 2A of Hashimoto et al is a good example of that. Therefore, the rejection finally stands.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2674

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald Laneau whose telephone number is 703-305-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM or via email: ronald.laneau@uspto.gov.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached at 703-305-4709.

9. **Any response to this final action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Ronald Laneau  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2674



RICHARD HJERPE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

rl  
September 16, 2002